

Serial No.: 09/781,851  
Examiner: Chirag G. Shah

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 13-36 remain in this application with claims 13, 19, 25 and 31 being independent claims. No claims have been amended herein.

In the outstanding office action, independent claims 13, 19, 25 and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gallant et al.* (US Patent No. 6,636,596) in view of *Smyth* (US Patent No. 6,678,246). In support of this rejection, the examiners points out that "Gallant, however fails to disclose that a switching device connected to the SIP-unobservant device and the switching device includes an emulation client." Additionally, the Examiner set forth that the gateway card 20 of Smyth was the "(emulation client) for performing conversion of traffic between formats used by the PBX and the format necessary for transport over the data network 30."

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In particular the present invention claims that the "emulation client" is "characterized in that a call *establishment message* transmitted by the SIP-unobservant device in a SIP-unobservant format is converted to a SIP-observant format by the emulation client..." (see for example independent claim 13). This is not what the gateway card 20 (i.e. asserted emulation client) performs. As set forth in *Smyth*, the functions of the IP gateway card are for the conversion of traffic between the format used by the PBX and the format necessary for *transport* over the data network (column 3 lines 56-58). In other words, the IP gateway card set for in *Smyth* performs the function of assembling voice data into packets for transport over the data network (column 4, lines 8-9). The IP gateway card in *Smyth* is for converting the voice data (traffic) into the proper format to be transported over the data network.

In contrast the emulation client as presently claimed, is for converting a call establishment message transmitted from a SIP-unobservant device in a SIP-unobservant format to a SIP-observant format and transmitted to a SIP-observant device. The "format" does not deal with the proper format to be transported over the data network, rather the format is so that a call establishment message from a SIP-unobservant device can be properly formatted for a receiving SIP-observant device. This is clearly not what is disclosed by *Smyth*. Therefore, as neither

134035

Page 7

Serial No.: 09/781,851  
Examiner: Chirag G. Shah

Gallant nor Smyth, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, teach, disclose or render obvious the present invention, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn. Regarding claims 14-18, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 13, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 13 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 13, Applicant asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 20-24, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 19, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 19 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 19, Applicant asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 26-30, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 25, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 25 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 25, Applicant asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 32-36, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 31, and therefore incorporate all the limitations of claim 31 therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 31, Applicant asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.


Serial No.: 09/781,851  
Examiner: Chirag G. Shah

It is believed that the foregoing places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of the claims, and full allowance of same. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Dated: 9/15/05

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL

  
Craig A. Hoersten  
Reg. No. 38,917

Alcatel  
Intellectual Property Department  
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2  
Plano, TX 75075  
Phone: (972) 519-5143  
Fax: (972) 477-9328